

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 5, 8, 12 and 14 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12 and 14 are currently amended.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of each independent and dependent claim pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the present action, claims 12, 13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,913,317 (Tiram). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite wherein the structure holds the mirror resiliently lateral to one side of the body and the mirror is laterally moveable to a second side of the body where the structure holds the mirror resiliently. Tiram does not disclose a structure allowing a mirror be moved laterally. The mirror in Tiram is laterally and vertically immobile, and may only change its angle relative to the hair trimming device. (Tiram, FIGs. 5, 10, 11 and 12) This is wholly different from the device of amended claim 12, where the structure may allow the mirror to be moved laterally from a first fixed position to a second fixed position.

Claims 13-16 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claims 12, which is allowable over Tiram for at least the reasons discussed above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 2-4, claims 1-5, 7-11, 14, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiram in view of US Patent No. 6,476,984 (Ringdahl). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite wherein said second mirror is held resiliently in one of two fixed positions lateral to the body. Neither Tiram nor Ringdahl suggest or disclose a mirror held resiliently in one of two fixed positions lateral to the body. By examiner's admission, Tiram does not disclose a mirror held in one of two fixed positions lateral to a body (Action, pg. 3). Ringdahl is relied upon to overcome the deficiency of Tiram. However, Ringdahl also does not disclose or suggest said second mirror is held resiliently in one of two fixed positions lateral to the body. Ringdahl appears to disclose a second mirror held in a position lateral to the body by a ball joint mechanism (Ringdahl, FIGs. 2-3, 5-8) or a gooseneck extension shaft (Ringdahl, FIG 4). While these devices may be used to hold the mirror of Tiram in a position lateral to the body, they do not hold the mirror in resiliently in one of two fixed positions. Both the ball-joint mechanism and gooseneck extension shaft are flexible, allowing for the mirror to be knocked out of position. The ball-joint mechanism holds the mirror in place based on friction within the ball-joints, but because the joints are designed to allow for freedom of movement, they are not resilient, and are instead easily moved and do not hold the mirror in any fixed position. The gooseneck extension shaft holds the mirror in place based on the structural properties of the material used to create the gooseneck extension shaft. The material must be flexible, to allow the gooseneck extension shaft to be movable. The result of the use of flexible material is a movable extension shaft that is not resilient, cannot hold the mirror resiliently, and does not have any fixed positions. The position of

the mirror is susceptible to movement by accidental jarring, as it is not held resiliently in a fixed position.

The ball-joint mechanism and gooseneck extension shaft of Ringdahl are wholly different from the structure of amended claim 1. The structure of amended claim 1 is resilient, allowing for the mirror to be held resiliently in one of two fixed positions lateral to the body and not be moved by accidental jarring. The mirror may be held resiliently in a first position, and moved from the first position to a second position through intentional application of force in the proper direction, and may be held resiliently in the second position. Amended claim 1 is therefore allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl.

Claims 2-4 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claim 1, which is allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl as discussed above.

Claim 5 has been amended similarly to claim 1, and is therefore allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl for the same reasons as claim 1, as stated above.

Claims 6 and 7 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claim 5, which is allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl as discussed above.

Claim 8 has been amended similarly to claim 1, and is therefore allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl for the same reasons as claim 1, as stated above.

Claims 9-11 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claim 8, which is allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl as discussed above.

Claim 14 has been amended similarly to claim 1, and is therefore allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl for the same reasons as claim 1, as stated above.

Claims 15 and 17 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claim 14, which is allowable over Tiram in view of Ringdahl as discussed above.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: May 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph P. Albrecht
Registration No.: 43466
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney For Applicant

DC2/856731